

“

THE HON'BLE SMT JUSTICE T.MEENA KUMARI
and
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.LAKSHMANA REDDY

WRIT APPEAL NO : 1344 of 2005

Dated: 26-07-2005

Between:

Tangirala Anjaneyulu S/o T. Satyanarayana, R/o D. NO. 9-9-36, Arundelpet,
Narasaraopet Guntur district

..... APPELLANT

AND

1 K. Sudhakar Sarma S/o Satyanarayana Issapalem Village Narasaraopet Mandal
Guntur district and others.

.....RESPONDENTS

THE HON'BLE SMT JUSTICE T.MEENA KUMARI
and
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.LAKSHMANA REDDY

WRIT APPEAL NO : 1344 of 2005

-

-

JUDMENT: (Per the Hon'ble Smt Justice T.Meena Kumari)

Challenge in this appeal is to the correctness of the order rendered by a learned single Judge of this Court dated 13-07-2005 in W.P.No.15069 of 2005.

02. Background facts sans unnecessary details are as follows:

03. 4th respondent appointed the appellant vide proceedings in R.C.No.A1/11057/2004 dated 21-04-2005 on a daily wage basis of Rs.70/-. Aggrieved by the said order, the 1st and 2nd respondents preferred a revision in R.P.No.9 of 2005 before the 3rd respondent-Regional Joint Commissioner of Endowments, Tirupati under Section 92 of the Endowments Act. The 3rd respondent by an order dated 28-05-2005 in I.A.No.4 of 2005 in R.P.No.9 of 2005, stayed the matter for a period of two weeks. Subsequently, neither stay was extended nor the matter was disposed of by the 3rd respondent. Questioning the same, the 1st and 2nd respondents preferred the writ petition.

04. After scrutinizing the entire material on record, the learned single Judge had directed the 3rd respondent to dispose of the revision expeditiously, preferably, within a period of three months. It is further directed that pending disposal of the revision, the stay order granted on 28.05.2005 shall continue.

05. Perused the material on record and the order impugned. Admittedly, a revision is pending before the 3rd respondent and therefore, the issue involved in that revision petition cannot be adjudicated at this stage of the proceedings. In that view of the matter, the learned single Judge is justified in directing the 3rd respondent to dispose of the revision pending before him while making it clear that the stay granted on 28.05.2005 shall continue. Therefore, we see no material irregularity or illegality in the order impugned. Accordingly, the writ appeal is liable to be dismissed.

06. In the result, the writ appeal is dismissed.

T.MEENA KUMARI, J

P.LAKSHMANA REDDY, J

26.07.2005

rkk/nn

